



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/575,123	05/23/2000	Kia Silverbrook	NPA006US	9158
24011	7590	04/13/2006	EXAMINER	
SILVERBROOK RESEARCH PTY LTD 393 DARLING STREET BALMAIN, NSW 2041 AUSTRALIA			RIES, LAURIE ANNE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 04/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center">Office Action Summary</p>	<p>Application No.</p> <p>09/575,123</p>	<p>Applicant(s)</p> <p>SILVERBROOK ET AL.</p>	
	<p>Examiner</p> <p>Laurie Ries</p>	<p>Art Unit</p> <p>2176</p>	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 February 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-8 and 11-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-8 and 11-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 May 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Request for Continued Examination, filed 2 February 2006, to the original application, filed 23 May 2000.
2. The rejection of claims 15 and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Dymetman ("Intelligent Paper", Xerox Research Centre Europe) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
3. The rejection of claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dymetman ("Intelligent Paper", Xerox Research Centre Europe) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment and newly found prior art.
4. The rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dymetman ("Intelligent Paper", Xerox Research Centre Europe) in view of Walker (U.S. Patent 5,995,976) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment and newly found prior art.
5. The rejection of claims 3-4, 16-19, and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dymetman ("Intelligent Paper", Xerox Research Centre Europe) in view of Greening (U.S. Publication 2001/0013009 A1) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment and newly found prior art.

6. The rejection of claims 5-7, 12, 20, and 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dymetman ("Intelligent Paper", Xerox Research Centre Europe) in view of Nozue (U.S. Patent 5,845,262) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment and newly found prior art.

7. The rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dymetman ("Intelligent Paper", Xerox Research Centre Europe) in view of Franklin ("A Framework for Scalable Dissemination-Based Systems", ACM SIGPLAN Notices) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment and newly found prior art.

8. The rejection of claims 14 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dymetman ("Intelligent Paper", Xerox Research Centre Europe) in view of Wiedemer (U.S. Patent 5,860,781) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment and newly found prior art.

9. The rejection of claims 8 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dymetman ("Intelligent Paper", Xerox Research Centre Europe) in view of Smith (U.S. Patent 5,181,162) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment and newly found prior art.

10. Claims 1-3, 5-8, and 11-14 are pending. Applicant has canceled claims 4, 9-10, and 15-29. Claim 1 is an independent claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1, 5-8, 11-12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dougherty (U.S. Patent 6,540,141 B1).

As per independent claim 1, Dougherty discloses a system and method for delivering a page of an interactive printed periodical on demand, where the page includes coded tags indicative of a page identity and of its own location on the page and enabling a user to indicate a request for further information relating to the contents of the periodical by interacting with an interactive element on the page, the system and method including determining a unique page identity for the page in a computer system (See Dougherty, Column 5, lines 65-67, lines, 44-49, and Figure 1, element 33).

Dougherty also discloses determining a page description for the page in the computer system including a description of graphical information on the page and the

description of the interactive element including a zone of the interactive element on the page (See Dougherty, Column 7, lines 3-34, and Column 8, lines 55-66).

Dougherty also discloses associating the page identity with the description of the interactive element (See Dougherty, Column 9, lines 10-21).

Dougherty also discloses generating first dot data, or data to be printed on a substrate, for the coded data using the page identity (See Dougherty, Column 9, lines 15-18).

Dougherty also discloses printing the page onto a substrate using the dot data on a printer networked with the computer system so as to produce a printed page of the periodical (See Dougherty, Column 9, lines 21-26, and Figure 3, element 208).

Dougherty also discloses that the step of determining a unique page identity and determining a page description for the page are performed prior to printing the page (See Dougherty, Figure 3).

While Dougherty does not disclose expressly that second dot data is generated for the graphical information using at least part of the page description, it was well known in the art to generate graphical data to be printed using a graphical interface. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to generate second dot data for the page description. The motivation for doing so would have been to draw a user toward a particular portion of a physical medium, such as a portion containing an interactive element, through the use of text, coloring, or other graphical elements describing a page and including a specific region or zone with which the user may interact (See Dougherty, Column 7, lines 3-10).

As per dependent claim 5, Dougherty discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Dougherty also discloses receiving in the computer system indicating data from a sensing device regarding the identity of the page and of a position of the sensing device relative to the page in order to identify the page and determine when the sensing device is used to interact with the elements (See Dougherty, Column 7, lines 28-67).

As per dependent claim 6, Dougherty discloses the limitations of claim 5 as described above. Dougherty also discloses receiving movement data regarding the position of the sensing device relative to the page (See Dougherty, Column 7, lines 24-27).

As per dependent claim 7, Dougherty discloses the limitations of claim 6 as described above. Dougherty also discloses that the sensing device senses its movement relative to the page using the coded data and identifies the response in the computer system from the movement being at least partially within a zone associated with interactive elements (See Dougherty, Column 11, lines 26-53).

As per dependent claim 8, Dougherty discloses the limitations of claim 5 as described above. Dougherty also discloses that the sensing device includes an identity code for a specific user and that the method includes monitoring the sensing device (See Dougherty, Column 12, lines 54-65).

As per dependent claim 11, Dougherty discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Dougherty also discloses printing the coded data to be substantially

invisible in the visible spectrum, such as by using infrared inks (See Dougherty, Column 5, lines 37-39).

As per dependent claim 12, Dougherty discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. It was well known in the art that electronically coded data is stored in a retrievable record within a computer system. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to retain a copy of the printed page in the computer system. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow multiple users to create and exchange their own encoded physical mediums (See Dougherty, Column 13, lines 43-49).

As per dependent claim 14, Dougherty discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Dougherty also discloses that the periodical is printed on multiple pages, such as in the form of a book (See Dougherty, Column 11, lines 26-29).

12. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dougherty (U.S. Patent 6,540,141 B1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Walker (U.S. Patent 5,995,976).

As per dependent claim 2, Dougherty discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Dougherty does not disclose expressly that the further information includes editorial content. Walker discloses including editorial information in relation to publishing information electronically (See Walker, Column 1, lines 14-18, and Column 2, lines 12-15). Dougherty and Walker are analogous art because they are from the same

field of endeavor of distributing data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the editorial content of Walker with the information delivery method of Dougherty. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow "surplus" information to be distributed to users thereby increasing profitability for the publisher (See Walker, Column 2, lines 24-39). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Walker with Dougherty for the benefit of allowing surplus information to be distributed to users thereby increasing profitability for the publisher to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

13. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dougherty (U.S. Patent 6,540,141 B1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Greening (U.S. Publication 2001/0013009 A1).

As per dependent claim 3, Dougherty discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Dougherty does not disclose expressly that the further information relates to advertising material. Greening discloses the inclusion of advertising materials based on a demographic profile of a user. (See Greening, Page 1, paragraph 0015). Dougherty and Greening are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of presenting information to users over a computer network. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the advertising information based on user demographics of Greening with the further information of Dougherty. The motivation for doing so would have been to create a

personalized experience for the user. (See Greening, Page 1, paragraph 0014).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Greening with Dougherty for the benefit of providing a personalized experience for the user to obtain the invention as specified in claim 3.

14. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dougherty (U.S. Patent 6,540,141 B1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Franklin ("A Framework for Scalable Dissemination-Based Systems", ACM SIGPLAN Notices).

As per dependent claim 13, Dougherty discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Dougherty does not disclose expressly including distributing information using a mixture of multicast and PointCast communications protocols. Franklin discloses using a combination of delivery mechanisms, including both PointCast and multicast. (See Franklin, Page 97, column 1, paragraph 5). Dougherty and Franklin are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of delivering information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the combination of delivery mechanisms of Franklin with the system and method of Dougherty. The motivation for doing so would have been to control the costs of initiating the transfer of data. (See Franklin, Page 5, column 2, paragraph 2) Therefore, it would have been obvious to

combine Franklin with Dougherty for the benefit of controlling data transfer costs to obtain the invention as specified in claim 13.

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

17. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more

Art Unit: 2176

information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR

William S. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
4/11/2006